

Appln No. 10/815,640
Amdt. Dated May 12, 2006
Response to Final Office Action of April 6, 2006

6

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated April 6, 2006.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to specify: "allocating and recording a unique reply code for the transmitted information, said reply code having a predetermined maximum number of reply transmissions associated therewith". Basis for this amendment can be found at page 54, lines 30-32 and page 55, lines 16-20 of the specification. A corresponding amendment has been made to claim 20.

Claims 8-10, 12, 13, 16-18, 27 and 31-35 have been cancelled.

Trivial amendments have been made to the remaining dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

In the recent Office Action, the Examiner maintains that it would be obvious to use Earl's Build and Transmit Score Report 84 to modify Earl's system so that only a predetermined number of reply messages can be transmitted.

The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's analysis of Earl. In the Applicant's submission, the most obvious use of Earl's Build and Transmit Score Report 84 would be to keep a count of the number of faxes sent for the purposes of tracking cost, restocking fax paper *etc.* Earl makes no suggestion of limiting the number of faxes sent and the Applicant submits that implying such a teaching from Earl's disclosure can only be done with prior knowledge of the present invention.

Nevertheless, in deference to the Examiner's maintained rejection, claim 1 has been amended to specify that the computer system allocates and records a unique reply code for the transmitted information, the reply code having a predetermined maximum number of reply transmissions associated therewith.

Earl does not suggest anywhere that a unique reply code should be generated to enable a maximum predetermined number of messages to be transmitted from the application to the user.

Given the clear differences between the present invention and Earl, and given the lack of any teaching in Earl that would lead the skilled person to the present invention, it is submitted that the present invention is not obvious in view of Earl, either taken alone or combined with any other documents.


Appln No. 10/815,640
Amdt. Dated May 12, 2006
Response to Final Office Action of April 6, 2006

7


It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



PAUL LAPSTUN



KIA SILVERBROOK



JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN



PAUL QUENTIN SCOTT

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762